

A SHORT 50
DEFENCE
OF 2
Infant's Baptism :
IN THE A

Correction of some of the Errors contained
in a late Pamphlet, Entituled, The Rector
Corrected, &c. By Edward Paye.

By a Lover of Peace and Truth.

*This Point hath been so sifted even to the very Bran,
that I cannot think mine Eyes so acute as to dis-
cern any little Argument to lye still neglected that I
should be able to bolt out. Aqua Genita. p. 447.*

*It is very well known that we do endeavour as much
as lies in us to reclaim all Dissenters, but God
never wrought Miracles to cure incorrigible Per-
sons. Bishop Stillingfleet's Answer to several
Treatises. p. 289.*

LONDON, Printed by W. B. for Richard Wilkin at
the King's-Head in St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1702.

S I

Hand
vate or
should
will ta
that it
we fin
cuse an
pears
Person
your C
are ple
Envy,
says,
hood h
influen
ing put
others
wheth
as Gu
those
appear
Origin
the Po
Infant
ny Me
Matte
ples,
Belief
canno
on Me



S I R,

TIS a good Observation that I've met with, that he who enters on Controversie should be acted with the Indifferency of a Traveller, who, provided he comes to his Journey's End, cares not whether the Way lie on the right Hand or on the left, or in the middle. Since if on any private or human Consideration, any one desires that one Way should be the right rather than the other; it is odds but he will take his Desire that it should be so, for an Assurance that it is so: But as this is a Temper but rarely found, so we find it difficult to obtain it. Every one is ready to accuse another for the want of it, tho' perhaps it abundantly appears that he himself is more departed from it than the Person he accuses. I wish this were not a little too much your Case; for that notwithstanding in your late Book, you are pleased to charge your Adversary with *being Infatuated by Envy, not having the least Regard to Truth in what he either says, writes or prints, making Lies his Refuge, and under Falsehood hiding himself; and that a couple of Parish Benefices doth influence him to this, tho' you complain of your Principles being put into Bear Skins by your Opposers, in order to fright others from embracing them; yet I appeal to all the World, whether you your self have not in this Book of yours been as Guilty, if not more so, of what you complain of, than those you have accused of it. For as I shall sufficiently make appear, You have in this Book of yours, assign'd a very false Original of Infant Baptism, as if it were only the Invention of the Pope's; you have mis-represented the Arguments brought for Infant Baptism; you have notoriously perverted or concealed many Mens plain Sense, and Meaning; you have falsified plain Matters of Fact; and lastly, have asserted many false Principles, which are contrary both to the Scriptures, and the common Belief of Christians. What hath influenc'd you to do this I cannot say; but I believe other things may have an Influence on Men to espouse a Party; besides a couple of Parish Benefices.*

I. Then, You've assign'd a very false Original of Infant Baptism, as if it were only the Invention of the Pope's, and

† R. C. Part 1.
p. 11.

* Part 2. p. 15,
p. 16.

† p. 31.

founded on his † Decretals; and say, * *That there is no Canon for Infant Baptism till the fourth Century, tho' as Dr. Stillingfleet (speaking of Transubstantiation) saith, it was long a hatching before it came forth.* But pray, is not this † *dress'ing up our Principles in Bear-*

skins? You know the Name of Pope and Popery is odious to the common People; and therefore you cannot think of a more likely way to prejudice them against the Practice of Infant Baptism, than by representing it as an Invention of the Pope's, and comparing it to *Transubstantiation*, one of the most monstrous and absurd of all the Doctrines which the *Popish Church* teaches. To this you add the

† R. C. Part 2.
p. 30.

joining Infant Baptism with the † Baptism of Churches and Bells; which I suppose you had not done, had you not thought by this Artifice to set your People against it. But to all this I

reply,
First, in the Words of Mr. Philpot the Martyr, in his Letter to his Fellow-Prisoner. *If, saith he, you look upon the papistical Synagogue only, which hath corrupted God's Word by false Interpretation, and hath perverted the true Use of Christ's Sacraments, you may seem to have a good Handfast of your Opinion against the Baptism of Infants; but for as much as it is of more Antiquity, and hath its beginning from God's Word, and from the use of the Primitive Church, it must not in respect of the Abuse in the Popish Church be neglected or thought inexpedient.*

Secondly, 'Tis false that Pope Innocentius did either decree or confirm the Baptism of Infants; since he only decreed, in Opposition to Pelagius, * *That Infants were*

* Caranza p.
114.

* Austin de
peccato origi-
nali cap. 18.

† Caranza p.
96. 105.

to be born or regenerated by Baptism; which Pelagius denied, saying, They were to be baptized that they might enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. On the contrary, 'tis most plain that as * Sr. Austin expresses it, *Infant Baptism was not instituted by Councils.* † Both the third and fifth Council of Carthage speak of Infant Baptism as a practice then in being, since the one orders that *Nothing should be exacted from*

those

*those t
That
baptiz
Write
the p
does
Tertul
cent A
that t
expre
tio ut
whole
never
'tis v
settim*

*Be
ther
for y
has b
forlon
false
Wor
Trut
roo
rists,
into
sure
is h
End
abou
they
Wh
the
dice
ough
you
pro
tell
do e
but
Ag
the
eno*

those that brought their Infants to be baptized; and the other, That such of whom it cannot be proved that they were certainly baptized in their Infancy, might be baptized. As to private Writers of the Church, I appeal to any one who has been at the pains to consult them, whether the most early of them does not speak of it as a thing commonly practis'd. Even Tertullian himself does so, by his saying, *Why does the innocent Age hasten to Remission of Sins, or Baptism*, he intimates that that Age did then hasten to it; and after all he does not express himself to be utterly against it; but only says *cunctatio utilior, that their staying longer is better*. So that on the whole I am forc'd to conclude with my Lord Brooks; *I could never find the beginning and first rise of this Practice; whereas 'tis very easie to track Heresies to their first rising up, and setting Foot in the Church*. But,

Before I go farther, I cannot omit taking notice of another Artifice of yours to prejudice your Reader against us; for you tell him over and over that || our Cause has been often confuted, and often baffled and || R.C. Part 1. p. 4 forlorn, than which nothing can be more * Part 2. p. 1. 2. false; and it is really pity to use your own Words, * That you have not discovered more — † Part 1. p. 5. Truth and Modesty. You tell your Reader too that † 'tis observable that these Gentlemen, the Pædo-Baptists, when they go to discourse with such that are enlightened into this great Truth of Believers Baptism, who can in some measure contend for it, then they leave them: What an Insinuation is here! as if the reason why our Ministers gave over their Endeavours to satisfy such who had entertain'd any Doubts about the lawfulness of the baptizing Infants, was because they could not answer the Objections brought against it. Whereas, as has been often tried both in Discourse and Print, the true reason is because you are generally so much prejudiced in behalf of this Principle, that None but Believers ought to be baptized, as to take no Answer to the Arguments you produce for it: And we know that God himself has provided no Remedy for Obstinacy, as Bishop Stillingsfleet tells his Adversary: *It's very well known that our Ministers do endeavour as much as lies in them, to reclaim all Dissenters; but God never wrought Miracles to cure incorrigible Persons*. Again you tell your Reader † that some of them, the Anabaptists, have Learning † R. C. Part 2. enough to baffle our often confuted Cause, P. 4.

would

would we stand a Discourse with them, but that to this we have no mind. For the Truth of this the Reader may see if he pleases the account of the Disputation betwixt Dr. Featly and them Anno 1642, Dr. Reading and Mr. Fisher at Folckstone in Kent 1650; and not to name any more, the late Dispute at Portsmouth betwixt the Presbyterians and them 1699; and by the Perusal of them, if he does it sincerely, I doubt not but he will be convinced, that the cause of Infant's Baptism has not been often confuted, that the Anabaptists have not Learning nor Truth enough on their side to confute it, tho' indeed baffle it they have often, nor that lastly the Assertors of Infant Baptism have no mind to stand a Discourse with them. On the contrary, they are ready at any time to do it, provided they could but have any manner of Hopes of doing any good by it. But when Men are so violently bent on an Opinion, as to scruple at nothing in order to maintain it, but even to sacrifice Peace and Truth for the Propagation of it, to what purpose is it to endeavour to satisfie such? And yet all this has been abundantly proved by the Writings of Mr. Danvers, and the late account of the Portsmouth Dispute published by Dr. Russel.

But yet for all this, I'm credibly inform'd that some of our Ministers have for the Satisfaction of those of their Parishioners who doubt about Infant Baptism, offered to dispute with any of those they thought most capable to oppose it: But that this has been refused, and all the Pretence that has been insisted on was that our Ministers desired this Dispute might be in the way of a private Conference, as judging that to be the best way to satisfie the Persons concern'd: Since in publick Disputes, as thro' the Multitude of People present a great deal of what is said is not heard; so he that talks loudest and says most is generally thought to have the best Cause. But,

II. You have misrepresented the Arguments brought by us for Infant Baptism; as first, you say that *because Male Children were circumcised at eight days old,* R.C. Part. 1. p. 3. *from thence Pado-baptists have weakly and rashly inferred, that all Infants, &c. must be baptized* — But are you sure that we argue thus? I never met with any Pado-baptist that did. On the contrary they argue

argu
both
then
ble
stand
Chri
grow
of E
a C
the
he
Her
was
fam
very
eter
to t
of
A
be
mar
to
Ro
tha
Je
the
the
fan
tha
No
wa
be
Gu
wh
if
im
no
fu
if
w
fe
G

argue thus, *If Circumcision and Baptism were for Substance, both respective Seals of the same Covenant of God in Christ, then those of Mankind who were capable of the one, are capable of the other: But Circumcision and Baptism were for Substance, both respective Seals of the same Covenant of God in Christ: Therefore those of Mankind, viz. Infants as well as grown Persons, who were capable of Circumcision, are capable of Baptism.* The Major may appear in that God never made a Covenant of Grace but only in Christ, and the same Gospel was preached to Abraham, and he believed in the same Christ, Gal. 3. 8. Hence the Covenant of which Circumcision was the Seal, is affirm'd to contain the very same Conditions, * Faith and Obedience, the very same Promises, † Justification here and eternal Life hereafter; and to have respect to the || same Mediatour Christ Jesus, as that of which Baptism is the Seal now.

* Gen. 15. 6.

Rom. 4. 11.

&c.

† Gen. 17. 7.

Heb. 11. 13.

|| Gal. 3. 8.

John 8. 56.

Again they argue, *If Infants were once commanded to be sign'd with the Sign of the Covenant, and this Command was never countermanded, then Infants ought still to be signed with the Sign of the Covenant. But, &c.*

Secondly, You mis-represent their Arguings from Rom. 11. 20. from whence the Pædo-baptists argue thus, that St. Paul speaking of the unbelieving Jews, and saying that *because of Unbelief they were broken off*, it does appear that the Christian and Jewish Church were the

R. C. Part. 1.

p. 10.

same, since it was the same Church of which the Jews were that they are said to be broken off from by their Unbelief. Now if the same Church continued under the Gospel which was in being before, then the very same who were Members of it before, continued so to be, except they became Guilty of what the Apostle lays down as the only Reason why any were cast out of the Church, viz. Unbelief: And if so, then those little Children which were of the Church immediately before their Parents became Christian, did not cease to be of the Church by their Parents becoming such, nor by any Alteration which the Gospel made: For if all they who were broken off, or not of the Church, were so by Unbelief, according to the Apostle's express Assertion, then unless the little Children we speak of were Guilty of Unbelief in themselves, or had it imputed to

them from their Parents they could not be *broken off*, but must still keep their standing as *Branches of the Olive-tree*. But now they could not be Guilty of Unbelief themselves, nor could they have it imputed to them from their Parents since *they* were Believers.

Farther, they argue from v. 16. That the Apostle asserts that as in Old Testament times, if the Root, if the Parents, Abraham's spiritual Seed were *holy*, separated to God, the *Branches* their little Children were holy also; so the same thing takes place and continues now under the Gospel Dispensation: And that therefore the Apostle does not say with Reference to times past, if the Root were *holy*, so were the Branches; but with Reference to the time present, if the Root be holy, so are the Branches.

Thirdly, You misrepresent their arguing from *Mat. 19. 14.* since they produce not that Text to prove that Christ baptized Infants; but to prove that the R. C. Part 1. p. 12. Infants of Believers are reckon'd as belonging to, or having a Right to be admitted into the Church; since our Lord says of *such is the Kingdom of God*. Now if they have a Right to be of the Church, they may be baptized; since by Baptism it is that this their Right must be asserted and claimed in order to their being actually in it, and entitled to all the blessed Privileges of it.

Fourthly, You mis-represent their arguing from *1 Cor. 7. 14.* for, you argue against them as if they asserted that by *holy* they meant a *real Holiness*, so that R. C. Part 2. p. 23. all the Infants of believing Parents are *really* holy; which never a Pædo-baptist that I know affirms, nay which you your self contradict a little before, by charging the Pædo-baptists with asserting a *Federal* or *Covenant Holiness*, as you do Part 1. p. 16.

2. You argue as if they entail'd *Grace to Nature*— which they deny to be any way the consequent of their Opinion, since the reason of little Children being a part of the Old Testament Church, and accordingly sign'd with the then initiating Ordinance, was not merely on account of their natural Descent from *Abraham*, but by virtue of the Promise made to *Abraham* as he was a Father of the Faithful. And therefore when any of the *Gentiles* were proselyted or converted to the Religion of *Abraham*, they were with their

their Children admitted to the same Privileges with the People of God, tho' they were not Children of *Abraham* according to the *Flesh* but according to *Faith*.

Fifthly, You mis-represent their arguing from *1 Cor. 10. 2.* as if they urged that place to prove *Circumcision a Type of Baptism*; whereas they on the contrary argue thus: " || *The Jews Passage* R. C. Part 2. p. 26.
 " *thro' the Red Sea was a Type of our Chri-*
 " *stian Baptism*; and if so it was in the Type
 " *that Men, Women, and Children passed* || Reli. Con. Part
 " *thro' the Red Sea, it ought to be so in* 1. p. 7.
 " *the thing typified*; and then the Children
 of believing Parents as well as themselves may and ought to be baptized.

To this Head I add, that you make wrong Inferences from what is produced by the Asserters of Infant Baptism. Thus from their saying that the word in *Mat. 28. 19* may be rendred make Disciples——by baptizing them. You infer that the Apostles might have gone among all the *Jews, &c.* and baptized them all——that they could lay their Hands on. But this does not necessarily follow, since they are *Discipled Nations*, who have embraced the Christian Faith, and they only, who with their Children are to be baptized. Children are indeed included in all *discipled Nations*, that is, whose Parents have believed the Christian Religion, and such Children may be *discipled* too by being baptized, and thereby entred into Christ's School, where, tho' at present they cannot, yet in time they may be taught.

Thus you infer from Pado-baptists, asserting that Infants are regenerated by Baptism, that they hold the Papists Opinion of Sacraments conferring Grace *opere operato*: But this by no means follows, since they may without this be by R. C. Part 1. p. 14.
 Baptism put into a new State or Condition; so that whereas before they were *Unclean, born in Sin, and Children of Wrath*, now they may be cleansed by the *washing of Water*, and *renewing of the Holy Ghost*, have their *Sins washed away*, and *put on Christ*, and thereby become the Children of Grace, or *Sons of God*. And this is no more than what the Scripture asserts, and you your self have or ought to have signed your Approbation of, in your signing among others the 27th Article of Religion;

gion; which affirms that Baptism is a Sign of Regeneration or New Birth, whereby as by an Instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church: The Promises of the Forgiveness of Sins, and of our Adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed, Faith confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of Prayer unto God. From whence 'tis plain that our Church does not assert that Sacraments do beget Faith or Regeneration, but are only Signs or Seals thereof; and particularly that God sealeth the Covenant or Promise that he will be our God and we shall be his People, by Baptism; and therefore you might have spared your Quotations from Mr. Baxter, Dr. Owen, &c. since we are not at all concern'd in them. But not to mention any more.

III. You falsly quote many Authors, and either pervert or conceal their meaning. As,

First, as to Mr. Baxter you quote his Words in his Dispute with Mr. Blake, as if he intended to exclude Infants from the Ordinance of Baptism; when he himself by way of Caution, tells his Reader in the same Book *That he would have him to understand that all along in the Discourse of the whole Book the Dispute is about the aged themselves, whether they may be baptized.* And again, p. 351. *We take it for granted that the Right of Infants (to Baptism) is upon the account of their Parents Faith, therefore we manage this Discourse with respect to the Adult.* The same Treatment you give to him, Part 2. p. 33. where you represent him as saying, *for when the Fryer's Hand was in he could do it to a Hands breadth*, when he says no such thing in the place you cite: But this is your old Artifice to make People believe that Infant Baptism was the Invention of the Popes, as you are pleased in expresse Words to assert, Part. 1. p. 12. As for what you quote out of Mr. Baxter's Directory, I can find nothing like it, but much of a quite contrary meaning.

Thus you've served Mr. Joseph Mede, picking here and there, leaving out, and adding as you see fit, tho' after all the place makes against you; since R.C. Part. 2. p. 7. if the Signification which he assigns to Baptism be true, viz. the renewing of the Holy Ghost, 'tis much more proper to pour Water on, than

than dip the Person baptized; since the *Holy Ghost* is said to be poured on, but we are never said to be dip'd or plung'd into *Him*.

In the same manner you treat *Wollebius*, who speaking of Baptism, and having before shewn what the *Matter* and *Form* is, here shews that the *Action* is sprinkling of Water, which is used instead of Immersion; and in his Note on this Rule, he observes that the *going into and coming out of the Water * The Words was an illustrious Symbol of the Burial and are immersio Resurrection of Christ; but that respect being and emerisio. had to the tender Age of Infants, we do in these colder Climates make use of Sprinkling, which 'tis credible the Apostles themselves also used in their baptizing Families at home.

In your Quotation of *Pool's* Annotations you'd have done well to set down the whole Sentence; for it follows what you quote, *But from hence it will not follow that Dipping is Essential to Baptism.*

Dr. Taylor in his *Dissuasive from Popery* p. 119. says, *That the Church of God whenever she did baptize Infants, did do it on Scripture Grounds.*

Part 2.p.18. You mis-represent the Counsel of *Gregory Bishop of Nazianzen*, since he does not advise that the Baptism of Infants should be deferred till they could give an account of their Faith. He would have indeed their Baptism deferred till they are three Years of Age; but you will not say that then they can give an account of their Faith: Besides he declares his Opinion that Baptism belongs to every Age and sort of Life, and particularly advises, *Thou hast, says he, an Infant, let not Iniquity get time, let it be sanctified in Infancy; let it in its tender Age be cleansed by the Holy Ghost.* — And again, *It is better if any Danger press, that Infants should be sanctified, [baptized] when they have no Sense of it, than that they should die unsealed and uninitiated.*

You falsly quote *S. Ambrose*, since you leave out a part of the Sentence. His Words are, *Now are they (your Children) Holy, because born in lawful Marriage, and because they are born under the Worship of the true God, the Creator, on the believing side; for as whatsoever appertains to Idols by Dedication to them is Unclean; so is that Holy which is born under the Profession of the true God the Creator.*
And

And now I appeal to your self, whether this Author does not think that *more* is meant in this Text than only a *Matrimonial Holiness*, or Legitimacy of Birth.

You falsly quote *Grotius*, who does not say that *Infant Baptism* was not enjoind before the Council of Carthage, but that in the Councils we have no mention of it before that Council. For that as I've shewn Infant Baptism is not enjoind by that Council. *v. p. 2^d.*

You partially quote *Dr. Hammond*, whose Words as they lie are, *The particular Faith is the acknowledging those Truths which are of more Weight than others, as — The Doctrine of the Trinity into which all are commanded to be baptized, and those other Fundamentals of Faith which all Men were instructed in anciently, before they were permitted to be baptized.*

You mis-represent *Mr. Daille*, who does not say that the Fathers are not to be leaned on in point of *Christ's great Ordinances*; but that they must not be esteemed *Infallible*, when they speak of the Points now in Dispute betwixt the *Romish Church* and *Us*. Tho' indeed I know of none who do hold that the Fathers are to be leaned on in point of *Christ's Ordinances*. In the Case before us we only mention them as *Witnesses* of what was done in their time, which their Errors do not incapacitate them for: We baptize Infants on *Scripture Grounds*, and not on the Authority of the Fathers; tho' as my Lord *Brooks* well observes, we think *that the constant Judgment of the Churches of Christ is much to be honoured*. But all this is not to be wondred at, when even *St. Paul* himself is not free from your Mis-representations: For thus you represent him as grieving at his Heart that the *Jews* had the first Tenders of the Gospel made to them, when he only expresses himself concern'd for their *Refusal* of them; as you may see *Rom. 11*. But.

† Remarks on the ancient Churches of the *Albygenses* p. 154. v. *Fuller's Holy State and War*, Book 3. cap. 20.

IV. You have falsified plain Matters of Fact. As first, You assert that the *Waldenses* denied Infant Baptism, which is absolutely false, and what indeed they were never charged with by any besides the *Papists* and your selves: Who, as *Dr. Allix* says † *endeavoured to make them own the Opinions and Crimes that were proper to the Manichees*

Manichees ——— That Baptism is not necessary to Infants, and many other Heresies that they would never acknowledge. The Confession mentioned by Sir Samuel Morland in his *History of the Evangelical Churches of Piedmont*, plainly shews their Opinion in this Matter. We receive, say they, the Eucharist to shew that our Perseverance in the Faith is such as we promised when we were baptized being little Children; and in another Treatise writ by one of their Ministers, Mr. Jean Leger, entitled *Histoire generale des Eglises Vaudaises*, printed at Leyden 1669. There are in one of their Confessions these Words, *Et que le Baptême est administré — a fin que celuy qui est receu soit réputé & tenu de tous pour Frere & Chretien — Et cest pour cela qu'en presenté les Infans au Baptême.* In English thus, We hold that Baptism is to be administered — to the end that he who receives it may be reputed and held by all as a Brother and a Christian, — and for that reason do we present Infants to Baptism, Lib. 1. cap. 12. Add, that the reason they give of their at any time delaying the baptizing their Infants, was the Abhorrence they had of the superstitious Rites used by the Papists in administering that Ordinance, and not that they held Infant Baptism unlawful. Dr. Usher in his *Succession of the Church* c. 8. p. 242. gives us an ancient Confession of the Waldenses made by them 1176, in the Body of which is this Article, *We believe little Children are to be saved by Baptism.*

Next you charge the ancient Britains with denying Infant Baptism, which is false. There is no one Historian that does so much as give the least Ground for such an Assertion, except Fabian, who besides that his Authority is not very good, may yet be so understood that they were only against the baptizing the Saxons Children, as they were against preaching the Gospel to the Saxons themselves. If the Britains had indeed been against Infant Baptism, we should without doubt have heard of it from Bede, who 'tis probable would have been glad to have such a thing to charge them with. But he only says that Austin desired of them, *That they would perform the Ministry of Baptism by which we are regenerated unto God, according to the Custom of the Holy* Bede's History Lib. 2. cap. 2.

Romani

Roman and Apostolical Church. After the same manner *Fox* in his *Acts and Monuments*, Vol. 1. p. 159. expresses it, that one of the things *Austin* desired of the *British Bishops* was *their baptizing after the manner of Rome*, so *Bishop Stillingsfleet* represents it, that *Austin* would have them follow the *Roman Custom in Baptism*. Not a Word is

there in all these of *Infants*; besides, 'tis plain that *Pelagius* who was a Monk in the same Monastery of *Bancho*, and lived 200 Years before this time, did own *Infant Baptism*; which 'tis not probable he would have done, being led by his Principle of denying original Sin, to deny that too, had it not been the Practice of the Church in which he had been bred.

Again, You charge *Wickliff* with denying *Infant Baptism*. But after the strictest Search into *Fox*, *Fuller*, *Sir Henry Spelman*, and *Cochleus*, I can find nothing like it, only in one Article he is charged to deny *Baptism* to be necessary to *Infants*, so as they cannot be saved without it: Which as *Bishop Usher* observes, *They in those days were charged with, who held nothing*

but this, that *Baptism* doth not confer Grace *ex opere operato*.

Next, You mis-represent *Spanhemius*, who does not say that the *Bishops* and *Canons* opposed the *Synod* in *Arms*, since besides that there was but one *Bishop*, and no *Synod* but a *Senate*: He only says, *That the Bishop sent Letters and an Ambassador to the Senate, wherein he advised them to cast the new Preachers out of the City and restore their old ones.*

But that when the *Bishop* saw that he could do nothing by *Threats*, and that the number of the *Gospelers* was so great as that he could not force them to do as he would have them, that *Business* was composed by the *Mediation* of the *Landgrave of Hesse*; and that from that time, for some Months, each attended on their several Rites or Way of Worship without any Tumult or Disorder, till some *Anabaptists* privately got together into *Munster*.

Next

Next you partially represent what Bishop Jewel says in his Defence of his Apology, p. 359. who does not, as you represent him, cast all the blame on the Boors or Rusticks, but owns what is said of the German Anabaptists to be true in these Words, *The Rebels at Munster were not Gospellers as ye seem to mean, but frantick Anabaptists and Hereticks as ye be; and therefore Enemies of the Gospel.*

I might add that you impose on your Reader, by telling him that the Hebrew **לָבַט** and the Greek βαπτίζω signify only to dip, whereas † Mr. Pocock who best understood the Oriental Languages of any in his time, has largely shewn that † Not. Miscel. cap. 9. Walker Doctrines of Bap. cap. 5, 6, 7.

Tabal and *baptizesthai* do not signify always the washing of the whole Body: Besides, the word *baptizo* is not used to signify to dip so much as once throughout the whole New Testament. But when the Act of Dipping is mentioned, the word *bapto* and not *baptizo* is used: Nay, even the word *bapto* does not always signify to dip, since Daniel 4. 33. that which we translate was *wet with the Dew of Heaven*, is in the Septuagint *ἡ δὲ δρόσος ἣς ἔπεσε ἐλάφην*, and I dare say that you will not affirm that *Nebuchadnezzar* was dip'd in the Dew of Heaven. You need not therefore have been so cautious as to stile all along in your Book *Baptism Rantism*, for that the word *Baptism* signifies any kind of Washing; or as *Scapula* expresses it, *lavandi seu abluerendi actus*, the act of washing or cleansing: Besides, it cannot be proved that either *John the Baptist* or the Apostles did dip all those they baptized; *St. Bernard* asserts that *Christ* was sprinkled by *John the Baptist* in *Jordan*, *Serm. de John Bap.* p. 1203. 'Tis true indeed they baptized in those times in Rivers; but *Bede* tells the reason of that, that it was in the beginning of the Church, when Temples were not yet built. Indeed it scarce seems credible that supposing they baptized then as you do now, that so many should be baptized in one day, as we read there were, viz. three thousand by *St. Peter*, and above ten thousand Saxons by *Austin* in the River *Swalle*, as *Cambden* tells us in his Preface, p. 136. Besides, it has been prov'd that other ways of baptizing besides that of Dipping have

have all along been in use in the Church. Thus Bishop Taylor quotes *Tertullian* speaking to an impenitent Person, *Who will afford thee so much as one sprinkling of Water?* meaning for his Baptism. 'Twas a common usage to baptize in Prison, which could not well be by dipping. *Cyprian* in Epist. to *Magnus*, Lib. 4. Ep. 7. tells us it was usual in those days to baptize sick Persons in their Beds. *Eusebius* Ecc. Hist. Lib. 6. c. 43. tells us that *Novatus* was thus baptized, being, says he, *sprinkled in the same Bed whereon he lay*. But if this does not satisfy you, I refer you to *Walker's Doctrine of Baptisms*, printed 1678.

Here therefore I add, that you misrepresent the Sense of those worthy Persons whom you quote for the Practice of Dipping, as if they held it in Opposition to *Baptizing* by *Sprinkling* or *Affusion*. We never denied that dipping was sometimes used in the Primitive Church; nay, our Church does now allow it to be done: But then we say too that *Sprinkling* and *Affusion* are as proper Ways of baptizing, since they are not contrary to the word of Institution, nor yet to the nature of the Sacrament of Baptism: It's no where forbidden in Scripture, nor condemn'd by any Council. *Rantism* as you call our Baptism is not rank'd among any Heresie: None of the Fathers dispute its Lawfulness, or dissuade from it: Many were by them baptized during their Sicknes, by sprinkling, and never that we find after their Recovery dip'd. And all this one would think should make you a little sparing of your Censures of it.

I shall only add under this Head, That you falsely charge the Reformers with persecuting those of your Opinion as to Infants Baptism: For that Part 1. p. 18. you cannot produce one Instance of any one put to Death merely for holding that Infants should not be baptized. They were other Principles that made the State think fit to punish them. *Pontanus* tells us indeed that through *Germany*, *Alsatia*, &c. 150000 Anabaptists were slain; but whoever reads *Sleidan* will know that they were not all Anabaptists who suffer'd, and that they who did suffer, 'twas not for their

Comment. Lib.
10.

their
Dea
held
Chri
Stat
ding
they
A
gene
in p
lity
not
Inve
and
allin
imit
not
niste
Scri
lieve
Prie
the
who
their
man
Add
Offic
ring
ridic
ties.
plain
that
land
have
ing
fant
stian
that
tures
ted
those
man

their Religion, but Rebellion. They who were put to Death here in England our Histories declare to have held vile and blasphemous Opinions against Christ, and the Peace and Welfare of the State; and that for them, not their holding the unlawfulness of Infant Baptism, they were thought worthy of Death.

Stow's Annals,
p. 679, 680.

And as you are thus injurious to the Reformation in general; so you are too bold in reflecting on this Church in particular. 'Tis no way like the Modesty and Humility of a Christian to stile Infant Baptism

not only a *no Baptism*, but a *Fiction*, *Man's Invention*, an irrational Notion, a Dream, and speaking Lies in the Name of the Lord, *acting a Tragedy*, a religious Cheat, an apostish Imitation of Christ's Ordinance. But this is

R. C. Part 1. p.
18, 16, 14,
Part 2. p. 24.
43, p. 10. p. 5.

not all, you compare the Bishops and Ministers of our Church to the Priests and Scribes, who are in Opposition to such as believe in Christ; who too much resemble the Priests, Pharisees, and Lawyers, who rejected

Part 1. p. 5,
19. Part 2. p.
6, 12, 5.

the Counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized; who reject the Commandments of God, that they may keep their own Traditions; and who teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men; being blind Guides, Baal's Prophets.

Add to all this, that you speak too contemptibly of the Office for Baptism in the Liturgy of our Church, comparing the Gossips, as you call the Sureties, to Necromancy, and ridiculing them, stiling them nominal Sure-

ties to blind the Eyes of the ignorant, and plainly to mock God, &c. Next you say that the Ministers of the Church of Eng-

R. C. Part 1. p.
7, 11, 16, 14.

land, with Ignorance or Confidence *enow* can say after they have acted the Tragedy (as they pretend) to God, *Seeing it hath pleased thee to regenerate this Infant*, &c. But pray is this the Language of a Christian? One would think indeed by this your Carriage

that you thought your self infallible, and that the Scriptures came out from you, and were only to be interpreted by you; else sure you would not so boldly censure those that are not of your Mind. You cannot deny that many that practice Infant Baptism are as *holy* and as *humble*

as your selves, and that they are as capable of finding out the Sense of the Scriptures: Why then can you not think that you may be mistaken as well as they? You

do indeed often assert *That the Gospel requires Faith and Repentance to qualifie for Baptism; and that now believing Men and Women are the only Subjects of Gospel Baptism.* And if this were prov'd the Dis-

pute would be at an end; but we cannot find any one Text that does either directly or by consequence say so: 'Tis true indeed we read of none but grown Persons that were baptized, and that of them *Faith and Repentance* was required. And this we think a good Argument to prove that no *grown* Person ought to be baptized without these Qualifications. But then a Question returns, What does this concern Infants, who are not any ways excluded by this? Since 'tis plain that God has always called and chosen the Children together with their Parents to be his People. Hence he stiles the whole Nation of the *Jews, Israel his called.* Nor has he given us any Intimation of the contrary, since the Coming of the Gospel. Besides, it's not plain and clear that there were no Infants baptized by the Apostles. They are not excluded by any thing contained in the Commission, *Mat. 28.* since they are a part of *all Nations*, and as capable of being discipled by Baptism as their Parents. And it is no sure arguing, we do not read that the Apostles baptized Infants, therefore they baptized none; since Christ and his Apostles did many things which are not recorded. The Scripture says nothing of the Baptism of the Virgin *Mary* and many of the Apostles, but we must not therefore think that they were not baptized: Besides, in such cases where there might be Infants, we don't find any Exception made. As far as I remember, there are not above nine besides our Saviour himself, who by Name or personal Description are said to have been baptized. Now it does not appear whether four of these nine had any Families or no; but as for the other five who had, the Apostles are said to baptize both *them* and *theirs*: So that what is recorded as to matter of Fact in the Holy Scriptures, is for *us*; or else it gratifies only the *Socinians*, who are of Opinion that none are to be baptized.

tized but such as are newly converted to Christianity from another Religion; since either the Baptism of Children is recorded in the recording of the Baptism of those Families which are said to be baptized; or else the Baptism of none is recorded in Scripture however after Christ's Resurrection, but of such who immediately before they were baptized were converted from *Judaism* or *Paganism* to *Christianity*: And if so, you can by no means warrant the baptizing of any Persons at Age, whose Parents were Christian when they were born. As to your Instances of our Lord and *Timothy*, whose Parents you say were Believers, 'tis a mere quibble, since they were none of them Christians when these their Children were born: Besides you don't read of *Timothy's* being baptized when grown up, and therefore if his Mother were a Christian when he was born, he might for ought you or I can tell be baptized in his Infancy.

As to Godfathers, &c. they are of ancient use in the Church, as serving to express the form of Covenanting betwixt God and us, which that Ordinance is the Seal of; and to put the Child in mind when he comes of Age to take this Obligation on himself, what a solemn Vow, Promise and Profession he did at his Baptism by them make. But for this you may see Mr. *Hewerdine's* Letters, &c. As to Baptism being said to regenerate, 'tis Scripture Language, wherein 'tis stild the * *washing* * Tit. 3. 5. of Regeneration.

As to what you say of the good of the *Portsmouth* Dispute, you may see your self answer'd in Mr. *Chandler's* Account of it, p. 65. where he has these Words, *We can hear of no unprejudiced Persons, who were any ways inclined towards Anabaptism by any thing that was offer'd in the Disputation; and we challenge them to name one Person so convinc'd — And do offer for one such Person so nam'd by them, we will, if they demand it, tell them the Names of several who did strongly incline to Anabaptism before, who by that Disputation were set right; and fully satisfied that the Anabaptist Cause doth rest on weak unscriptural Principles, how loudly soever they pretend to Scripture.*

Lastly, You have asserted many false Principles, which I shall only name, and not now stand to refute. As,

First, You say that ~~original Sin~~ original Sin is only bodily Diseases and a temporal Death. If, say you, *Infant Baptism take away original Sin, then Infants shall*

R. C. Part 1. p. 15, 19. Part 2. p. 33. *have no Toil, nor Sickness, Sores, Sorrows, nor Death it self. This is contrary to Article 9. of our Church, and the common Faith of Protestants, and is only taught by the Socinians.*

R. C. part 2. p. 22. *Secondly*, You assert that the Sacrament of Baptism is no Seal of the Covenant; contrary to the express words of Article 27.

Thirdly, You call the Old Testament Church a carnal Church, and say that *Circumcision gave right to carnal Ordinances, and an earthly Canaan; and deny that the Christian Church is but the old Reformed; contrary to what is asserted in Article 7.*

Fourthly, You resemble Infants to Bells, Fruit-trees, Cattle, &c. which is very unseemly; sure you must have a very low Opinion of Infants thus to compare them to brute Beasts and inanimate Creatures: But R. C. Part 1: p. 10, 12, &c. *pray, have Bells and Beasts and Fruit-trees reasonable Souls? Did you ever read that our Lord Jesus did bless Bells and Cattle, and Fruit-trees, and pray for them as he did for Infants? pray be so kind as to leave off such Comparisons; which, to say the best of them, are unseemly, and no ways becoming a Christian Pen.*

Lastly, You speak too irreverently of the Doctrine of the Sacred Trinity, as seeming to approve of what you say one terms it, *confused Nonsense*, Part 1. p. 20.

Thus I've gone through I think your whole Book: There are some Authors you mention which I have not, and therefore could not examine; and I've reason to think that for all your quoting them, you your self never saw some of them: For I have all along observed you transcribing out of M. *Danvers*, and that so carefully, that you've even transcrib'd his Faults; thus part 2. p. 38. Mr. *Danvers* having said the *Synod* siding, &c. you've said so too, tho' it be a plain Mistake for *Senate*. Thus again, part 2. p. 22. for want of examining whether Mr. *Danvers* be faithful in his Citations or no, you have transcrib'd from him Words which Mr. *Tombs* and He charges on Mr. *Blake*, which Mr. *Blake* yet denies that he
ever

ever said; and so indeed one would think, for neither of them name Mr. *Blake's* Book from whence they took them. The Words are as you cite them, Birth-Privileges are Hereditary, &c. This Mr. **Wills* tells us M. *Blake* signified to Mr. *Tombs* that he disowns the **Vide Wills's* Words he charges him with. I believe, Infant Bap. asserted, p. 198. saith he, no such thing, that Parents convey to their Children, as by Birth Privilege a being in Christ Jesus; but if you understand by Christianity the bare Name or Title of Christian, together with a right to Church-Privileges, then I shall own the thing and disclaim the Expression.

As to what you say concerning the different Grounds and Ends of Infant's Baptism, it being an Objection already insisted on by Mr. *Tombs*, *Danvers*, and *Keach*, you may see it answer'd by Mr. *Wills* in his Infant Baptism asserted, p. 153, and 263. and a Religious Conference, printed ann. 1698. p. 28.

I conclude all with the saying of Bishop *Patrick* in his *Aqua Genitalis*, p. 452. I have no mind to add more, but beseech the Lord, that all those who dispute against Infant Baptism, may behave themselves like Men baptized, and remember, that *Humility*, *Modesty*, and *Peaceableness of Spirit* are great Doctrines in the Christian School; and that if so many good and learned Men have erred (as they think) then so may they.

I am,

Yours to serve you in

Jan. 21. 1702.

all Christian Offices,

Philaethes.

POST.

POSTSCRIPT.

TO what I have already written I only find occasion to add, That for all your so positively asserting that the Parents of *St. Austin*, *St. Hierom*, and *Ambrose* were Christians, [I presume you mean when these their Children were born] you cannot prove that they were so: On the contrary, it has been proved that some of them were not: That you impose on your Reader, by telling him the Learned tells us 'tis in the *Syriack* Version of *Acts* 16. 34. *He believed with all his Sons*, when on the contrary it is *with all his Domesticks*: That both *Mr. Blackwood* and you falsely assert that *Cyprian* was not for Infant Baptism, in the place of *Baronius* that you mean, tho' you falsely quote it, it being *Tom. 1. p. 415. edit. Antw. 1612.* there is not a word of Infant Baptism, but only that *Cyprian* opposed what Pope *Stephen* held as supported by the Tradition of the Church: That Baptism administered by Hereticks ought not to be repeated: That you abuse *Mr. Calvin* as to his Exposition of *Matth. 3. 6.* who adds to the words you cite from him, *farther, it is to be observed that these words Repent, &c. are to be understood of the Adult.* As to Doctor *Barlow's* Letter so much boasted of by you, you may see the Doctor's Opinion of it in a Letter wrote to *Mr. Wills*, printed in *Wills's* Infant Baptism re-asserted; where he has words to this effect, *That 'twas wrote, when he talk'd more, and understood less, and that he never refused baptizing of Infants.* And now would not any one infer from all this, that yours is a poor and baffled Cause, since you need so many Shifts and Tricks to support it. But this is not the worst of it; you are not content with acting thus, but you treat those who differ from you with insufferable Scorn and Contempt: Thus you call the Church of *England's* way of Administring Baptism, *Antick Noddings*, *Cringings*, *Crossings*, and compare her Baptism to *Transubstantiation*. You call
in

in Question Her Ministry, saying, *That the Priesthood of the Nation have assumed the Sacerdotal Office, from what Gospel Right you see not ; and in another Place intimate, That She is only supported by the Civil Power:* Nay, not content with this, you seem to intimate as if you thought the Doctrine of the Trinity *confused Non-sense*, and the *holding many Gods*. On the whole I beg you to consider, whether indeed in this matter you have acted like one who impartially sought after the Truth ; since *that* needs none of those ways to support it which I've shewn you've used : You need not *lie* for God, He will maintain the Cause that is His without those Helps. Farther, I beseech you carefully to consider the Temper you've express'd in this Writing of yours, how contrary it is to the Spirit of Christianity : And therefore supposing you were in the right as to this particular matter, which yet you are not, you cannot be safe so long as you continue of it. 'Tis good Advice which one formerly of your Opinion as to Infant Baptism gives, which I shall leave with you to consider ; *That the dissent of those who differ from other godly Christians in the point of Infant Baptism be held and managed with much Humility and Sobriety towards those that differ.* Since after all you cannot be so sure of your being in the right, and our being in the wrong, as justly to use that Assurance which is so visible in your Writings ; and to condemn all that oppose you, as blinded by worldly Interest, as if none in the World had any Conscience beside your selves.

BOOKS

BOOKS written in Defence of Infant Baptism.

Doctor Hammond's Letter concerning Infant Baptism,
Lond. 1653.

— Baptizing of Infants reviewed and defended against
the Exceptions of Mr. Tombs, Lond. 1655.

Dr. Reading's Antidote against Anabaptism, in Answer to
Dr. Taylor's Liberty of Prophecie, Lond. 1654.

Dr. Hicke's Case of Infant Baptism.

Dr. Ashton's Conference with an Anabaptist.

Mr. Ollyffe's Defence of Infant Baptism.

Mr. Wills's Infant Baptism asserted and re-asserted, in Answer
to Mr. Danvers's two Books.

Mr. Will. Allen's Persuasive to Peace and Unity.

— Address to the Non-conformists.

Mr. Hewerdine's Letters in Defence of Infant Baptism.

Mr. Walker's modest Plea for Infant Baptism.

— Discourse of Dipping and Sprinkling.

A Religious Conference betwixt a Minister and Parishioner,
being an Answer to Benj. Keach's late Book stit'd the *Restor*
Religified, Lond. 1698.

Mr. Turner's Vindication of Infant Baptism.

Mr. Burkit's Discourse of Infant Baptism.

Mr. Dorrington's Vindication of the Christian Church in bap-
tizing Infants.

A serious Address to the Anabaptists.

